### SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS

**LOS ANGELES, CA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>June 22, 2005 1:00-5:00 pm</th>
<th>Location: Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District of Southern California 700 North Alameda Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</td>
<td>To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: [http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm](http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm)*

**Presenters:**
- **Martha Davis**, Advisory Committee member, Inland Empire Utilities District
- **Nick Di Croce**, Advisory Committee member, California Trout
- **Kamyar Guivetchi**, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)
- **Julia Lee**, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento
- **Mark Stuart**, District Chief, Southern District, DWR

**Introduction: Format and Purpose**

Julia Lee, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop. She thanked Tim Worley of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern CA for making the meeting facility available. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee members Nick Di Croce and Martha Davis spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Southern District Chief Mark Stuart gave a presentation on the South Coast Regional Report, which is located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for individuals to orally present prepared statements. For a detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

**Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B**

A) **Background & Overview** / B) **Comments from the Advisory Committee**

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial
stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the content and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee members Nick Di Croce and Martha Davis explained the Advisory Committee View, a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement and points of disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and uncertainties remaining in the Water Plan.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liked</th>
<th>Would Change</th>
<th>Don’t Know, Have Questions About:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table 1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table 1:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Liked the scenarios, very forward thinking, enhanced strategic planning process.</td>
<td>∆ More information in funding scenarios and phasing.</td>
<td>• Why is public trust under the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Liked water use efficiency.</td>
<td>∆ Would like to see enhancement on relationships between water and energy conservation.</td>
<td>• How does the state see the customer segments; what does it look like, what does the industrial sector look like in 25 years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Integrated regional planning is an important approach.</td>
<td>∆ Would like to see how general public sees the state planning over 25 years.</td>
<td><strong>Table 2:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Liked global climate incorporation.</td>
<td>∆ Optimize operations of the State Water Project, the Central Valley Project, and other major infrastructure as recommendations in the Water Plan.</td>
<td>• Will disagreements among the Advisory Committee be discussed in the Water Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrated water quality, storage, and supply</td>
<td>• Concern: document looks at things over which the state doesn’t have control; the state should have more control over major supplies to affect policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table 2:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table 3:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments.</td>
<td>• The State should take over Central Valley Project operations and have a stronger plan for integrating all agencies.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 3:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table 3:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table 4:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Implement all 3 phases.</td>
<td>• Flood management in urban areas is an important opportunity.</td>
<td>• No apparent way of getting feedback; how do we know if our statements about this have been heard?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Excellent progress, good approach.</td>
<td><strong>Table 2:</strong></td>
<td>• Should we rely on the Delta when it is in trouble?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Inclusion of a broad/diverse Advisory Committee led to better strategies.</td>
<td>+ Impressed with the Implementation Plan.</td>
<td>• Conflict between Delta water quality for people and for fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Felt that the process is balanced.</td>
<td>+ Liked the scenarios.</td>
<td>• When is the next Water Plan due for release, based on the phase approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Good input by the Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>+ High marks for including water quality.</td>
<td>• Water bags – suggested that DWR see written report submitted (by Terry Sprague).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 4:</strong></td>
<td>+ High marks for the full systems approach, linking water quality and supply.</td>
<td>• How will regions from different basins interact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Impressed with the Implementation Plan.</td>
<td>+ Liked integrated water management, especially at the regional level.</td>
<td>• What does “regional integration” mean?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Liked the scenarios.</td>
<td>+ Liked DWR staff; efforts are sincere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Comment Forms:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Individual Comment Forms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Extensive public input from the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ground floor up!
+ Presentation well done.
+ Liked integrated approach.
+ Liked linking water quality, supply, and habitat/watershed functions.

elsewhere than Bulletin 118.
  o Look to regional distribution.
  o Link to water quality

Δ State should take the lead in optimizing water projects in order to improve efficiency, water quality, deliver highest quality of water;
Δ State ought to take over operations of CVP to have integrated statewide approach.

Table 3:
Δ Seek more input from nonprofit organizations.
Δ Fell short of allowing capacity for grassroots groups to participate because of length and funding of process (meetings out of town).

Table 4:
Δ Wanted more in the Implementation Plan.
Δ Water Plan should focus more on water conservation.
Δ Would like more priorities identified.

Individual Comment Forms:
Δ Need storage of precipitation runoff.
Δ Need more emphasis on conservation.
Δ Add a third Initiative called “Conservation” for the Framework for Action. It should be front and center.
Δ Don’t just call out tribes as government entities – city and county governments need to be included in this bullet. Malibu is as big if not a bigger challenge than tribal governments.
Δ Ecosystem restoration must be one of the 15, not 14 recommendations.
Δ Add more discussion of low impact development.
Δ More integration of water and energy conservation.

Individual Comment Forms:
• How do we deal with conflict between DWR, CA Department of Health Services, CA Department of Toxic Substances Control, and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards in the use of storm water, recycled water, and restoration waters for several different uses?
Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D
C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and accomplishments. Chapter 3 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1, it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented slides on California Water Today and statewide water balances, and Southern District Chief Mark Stewart summarized the Volume 3 regional report for the South Coast.

Below is a summary of comments made by individuals at the tables in response to these questions:

**Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liked</th>
<th>Would Change</th>
<th>Don’t Know, Have Questions About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Liked integrated regional planning – going in the right direction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Like the way the Water Plan is broken down into hydrologic regions, but would prefer using subregions (Metropolitan areas, Santa Ana Watershed Planning Area, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Layout of report is good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Liked diverse statewide issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Comment Forms:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Liked regional approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ We would like to look at things by region in the Water Plan; break up the South Coast into regional borders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Need to use urban water management plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Verify the bar chart of use and supply – recycled water shows more in wet years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Challenge the assumptions that population will increase; describe population of infill and migration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Chart is not complete – use and supplies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Evapotranspiration applied water for agriculture is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Water relations with Mexico should be addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Water Flow Diagram unclear; use terms that decision makers would understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Add funding inputs into the scenarios processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>△ Need to address agricultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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water use efficiency vs. water supply rights.

- For South Coast region, discuss factors other than population – land development and urban sprawl.
- For Agricultural water use efficiency, need to discuss metering issues and cost issues.
- Address implications of state water policy to people in Mexico.
- Address impacts to the environment.
- Local challenges – add stormwater management as a strategy.
- Discuss technology advances in agricultural hardware.
- Study impervious surface vs. pervious surface impacts to percolation.

Table 4:
- Need more information to make decisions on a regional basis.

Individual Comment Forms:
- Incorporate the Pacific Institute Report due out at the end of June.
- Need feedback from within the regional water agencies about actual water use.
- Need more emphasis on conservation and recycling as a block of the Water Plan.
- The Water Plan needs more emphasis of land use related to water availability.
- Water transfers should only happen based on conservation policies completed prior to transfers.
- Emphasize urban conservation.
- Make more clear actual water usage vs. applied water usage.
- Need better explanation on graphs for “John Q. Public” to understand.
- Add more statewide challenges

- Need information from urban water management plans (that won’t be finished before the end of the year) to know how many agencies are planning to reduce imported water supplies.
- Need information from small districts to integrate with major entities.

Individual Comment Forms:
- How does the Water Plan address precipitation runoff statements (not specifically Southern CA)?
- How stable is the aging water delivery infrastructure?

Individual Comment Forms:
- Why was less water reused in the dry year (2001 Water Balance)?
- What is the basis for water reuse?
- How does the Water Plan account for conservation, recycling, reclamation, and stormwater use?
- What is “applied water”?
| – salmon/steelhead and wildlife/T&E species need to be called out as a challenge. |
| Δ Regional challenge – future development, impervious surfaces, urban runoff, NEMO. |
| Δ Add information on how Southern CA agencies plan to reduce reliance on expected water. |
| Δ Add information on the connection between land use decisions and water supply and reliability. |
Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liked</th>
<th>Would Change</th>
<th>Don’t Know, Have Questions About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Table 1:**  
+ Liked having multiple scenarios – well discussed. | **Table 1:**  
∆ Would like to see scenarios built up from local to regional levels.  
∆ Make a decision on one scenario – multiple creates confusion.  
**Table 3:**  
∆ Must consider watershed management as a strategy (runoff) – should be a positive objective.  
**Table 4:**  
∆ Need an audit of groundwater deficit assumptions.  
∆ Need an assumption that the Delta ecosystem will crash.  
∆ Need more detailed cost information for elements of future strategies.  
∆ Need a more sophisticated model that will address the environment, water quality, ecosystem, and environmental justice…  
**Individual Comment Forms:**  
∆ Recommend more conservation requirements in urban areas, i.e. golf courses, schools, parks, etc.  
∆ Recommend against allowing quality agricultural land to be changed to urban.  
∆ Get tribal governments to contribute to funding of state water systems.  
∆ Recommend better ways to use precipitation runoff. | **Table 1:**  
• What framework and assumptions were used for the scenarios?  
• Can the methodology be used for smaller areas?  
• How much flexibility does the framework have?  
• What is DWR’s vision how the framework will be implemented at the regional and local levels?  
• How does this work across boundaries?  
**Table 2:**  
• The Tulare Hydrologic Region is an interesting case – all scenarios show declines in water use in this region.  
• Central Valley water use will not decline as agriculture changes to urban.  
• Water reuse is a difficult concept to quantify for the future (the bar chart doesn’t satisfy everyone).  
• Concern: There will eventually be a food shortage.  
• Concern: In Kern, Tulare, Fresno, and Merced, farms that aren’t making money are replaced with houses.  
• Concern: Are we encouraging suburban sprawl in agricultural lands?  
• Concern that water reuse may be undercounted in the Water Plan.  
• Concern: Desalination seems like an endless supply but need to consider cost component. Reclamation cannot meet TDS standards, so we lose the amount of reclaimable water.  
• Desalination is not a panacea.  
• Think about long term sustainability when managing |
the environment; may need to reprioritize how environmental water is used.

**Table 3:**
- Are salmon and steelhead issues addressed in the South Coast Regional Report?
- What were the assumptions in the scenarios?
- Conservation potential was positive, but can it be achieved?

**Table 4:**
- Need to standardize data within and between regions
- Need to organize regional stakeholder groups ASAP.
- How does the Water Plan measure and account for environmental justice?
- How do we balance the needs among fish, water quality, environmental justice, urban, agriculture, and the environment?

---

**Part 4 Additional Public Comments**

- Length of time and amount of work were barriers to the process.
- Concern that many people wanted to learn about the Water Plan; not ready to talk about details at the public workshops.
- Concerned about timing of Water Plan Updates. Urban Water Management Plans are released on years 5 and 10, and the CA Water Plan Updates have been traditionally released in between those years. This makes it hard to for these different plans to fully take advantage each other’s data.
- Incorporate the Pacific Institute’s new water report due out in June.
- Computer model (CalSim II) needs to be revised to include conservation, environmental requirements, water quality standards and constraints against water deliveries.

**Part 5 – Formal Public Comments** (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. Three members of the public were registered for speaker comments:

**Jim Steward, Best Technology Company**

Mr. Steward spoke to promote a technology called “Free Flow.” This technology uses physics that extracts dissolved calcium out of water as microcrystals. That prevents scale on drip lines and hardpan in the soil, resulting in greater porosity and water flow to roots. It is an alternative to acid treatments. He stated that there have been a number of documented studies that show that this technology
promotes better quality crops for about 20% less water. Mr. Steward stated that if “Free Flow” technology is used throughout California, it could save an estimated 6 million acre feet per year for agriculture.

David Nesmith, Environmental Water Caucus:

Mr. Nesmith called attention to a leaflet that he had brought to the meeting. He mentioned that he had told DWR that this is a good plan for several reasons. Mr. Nesmith stated that water from the Delta is unreliable; in the last 4 years the Delta ecosystem has shown signs of major collapse. The South Delta Improvement Project could also be called the “South Delta increased pumping project.” He asked people to direct their attentions and efforts to more reliable regional water supply alternatives. Otherwise, the Delta system will become less and less reliable for the rest of the state.

Mr. Nesmith submitted a written leaflet, which is posted on the CA Water Plan Public Comments website at http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/comments/update2005/prdcomments.cfm

Terry Spragg, Terry G. Spragg & Associates

Mr. Spragg presented what he called “world’s strongest zipper,” which he said could be used to haul water up and down the California coast as an alternative conveyance route to bypass the Delta. If an earthquake occurred on the Hayward fault, there is no major plan for alternative water deliveries. With these zippers, water bags could be filled at Sacramento Harbor and shipped down to Southern California. Mr. Sprague stated that Curt Schmutte, Chief of Delta Levees, North Branch, DWR, has a plan and the economics are well defined.

Mr. Spragg submitted written comments, which are posted on the CA Water Plan Public Comments website at http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/comments/update2005/prdcomments.cfm

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

Inna Babbitt, City of Pasadena Water & Power
Sonja Bartsch, League of Women Voters (Pasadena)
Mark Beuhler, Coachella Valley Water District
Kirk Brewer, California Water Association / Southern California Water Company
Alyce Brookfield, Occidental College
Kathy Caldwell, CH2M Hill
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Bob Campbell, Public
David Cordero, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Martha Davis, Inland Empire Utilities District
Nick Di Croce, California Trout
Michael Durand, University of California, Los Angeles
Joan Dym, Southern California Water Committee
Conner Everts, POWER
Brandon Goshi, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Jill Gravender, Environment Now
Allen Gribneu, Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
Dan Griset, Southern California Association of Governments
Greg Gunther, Southern California Wetlands Recovery Project
Sondra Hauge, League of Women Voters (Pasadena)
Ted Having, Eastern Municipal Water District
Philip Huffeldt, Occidental College
Jagjit Kaur, CH2M Hill
Francie Kennedy, City of San Juan Capistrano
John Kilkeary, PM Consultants
Mary Lou Cotton, Castaic Lake Water Agency
Jay Malinowski, MPI
David Nesmith, Environmental Water Caucus
David O’Donnell, TreePeople
Christopher Patton, City of Los Angeles
Lynne Plambeck, SCOPE
Jane Raftis, City of Pasadena Water & Power
Justin M. Scott-Coe, Integrated Resource Management, LLC
John Slezch, Public
Michael Sonnen, Construction Engineer
Terry Spragg, Terry G. Spragg & Associates
Samantha Stevens, Environment Now
Jim Stewart, Best Technology Company
Peer Swan, Irvine Ranch Water District
Jeffery Szytel, HDR
Gene Talmadge, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
Rich Whetsel, Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
Tim Worley, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
Deb Whitney, Eastern Municipal Water District
Damien Young, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Staff:

Glenn Berquist, DWR
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Robert Fastenau, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
David Inouye, DWR
Linda Inouye, DWR